Appeal: 11-6419 Doc: 5 Filed: 06/01/2011 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6419

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SHAWN ANTONIO WILEY,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Frank D. Whitney, District Judge. (3:03-cr-00205-FDW-1; 3:11-cv-00046-FDW)

Submitted: May 26, 2011 Decided: June 1, 2011

Before KING, SHEDD, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Shawn Antonio Wiley, Appellant Pro Se. Robert John Gleason, Assistant United States Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Shawn Antonio Wiley seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion as untimely filed. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Wiley has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials Appeal: 11-6419 Doc: 5 Filed: 06/01/2011 Pg: 3 of 3

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED